

REMARKS

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the telephonic interviews with the Examiner conducted on April 8, 2003 and June 4, 2003 and the voicemail message the Examiner left on July 22, 2003. Applicant has attempted to address the issues raised by the Examiner in the interviews and in the voicemail message with this response.

Applicant requests reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 10, 11, 15-19 and 21 have been cancelled. New claims 22 and 23 have been added and are pending. Claims 22 and 23 are independent claims.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The Examiner noted that some of the references provided previously and cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed June 13, 2002, which were not available in the parent application No. 09/284,895 referenced in that Information Disclosure Statement and which were subsequently provided in a supplemental Information Disclosure Statement filed January 21, 2003, are still missing. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the copy of paper No. 11 sent by the Examiner with the Advisory Action mailed on May 23, 2003 showing that the references sent with the Supplemental IDS filed on May 14, 2003 have been considered.

DRAWING OBJECTION

The Examiner objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84 (p)(4). Specifically, the Examiner asserted that reference numerals "58" and "54" were both used to designate valleys in FIG. 8. In the telephonic interview on June 4, 2003, the Examiner indicated that the proposed drawing correction filed on May 14, 2003 was approved.

35 U.S.C. § 102 REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 11, 15-19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Milo U.S. Patent No. 6,206,911. In the Advisory action mailed on

July 9, 2003 the Examiner indicated that the rejection had been overcome by the response mailed on June 16, 2003.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 11, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Killion, U.S. Patent No. 5,868,781. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. With this paper, the rejected claims have been cancelled without prejudice. Therefore, the rejection is moot.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 6, 10, 11, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hiroyuki et al. (JP 10201856 A). In the Advisory action mailed on July 9, 2003 the Examiner indicated that the rejection had been overcome by the response mailed on June 16, 2003.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER


Applicant is grateful for the Examiner's indication, in the voicemail left on July 22, 2003, of allowable subject matter in claims 6 and 17. Claims 6 and 17 have been rewritten in independent form as claims 22 and 23, respectively, to include the limitations of the base claim (claim 1) and any intervening claims. It is respectfully asserted that independent claims 22 and 23 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has attempted to respond to each and every rejection set forth in the outstanding Office action. In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the application be reconsidered, the claims allowed and the application passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP

By: 
Richard C. Salfelder
Registration No. 51,127

RCS:mv:rms

Enclosures Petition for one-month extension of time
Fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a)

Howard Hughes Center
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Telephone: (310) 824-5555
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696
Customer No. 24201

19946.1